



**ERIC GIBSON**  
DIRECTOR

# County of San Diego

## DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666  
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960  
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017  
[www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dplu](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dplu)

October 7, 2010

### **CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. March, 2010)**

1. Title; Project Number(s); Environmental Log Number:

Beauvais Major Subdivision; 3100 5315 (TM); Log No. 03-02-035

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,  
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact: Katie Hughes, Project Manager

b. Phone number: (858) 495-5845

c. E-mail: [katie.hughes@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:katie.hughes@sdcounty.ca.gov).

4. Project location:

The project is located on Old Castle Road, east of Alta Mira Lane intersection, in the Valley Center Community Plan Area, within the unincorporated County of San Diego area.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1069, Grid 5/H

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Wayne Beauvais  
1050 Maryland Drive  
Vista, CA 92083

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:

Land Use Designation:

Valley Center

(17) Estate Residential

- 2 -

Density: 1 du/2/4 acre(s)

7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: A70; Limited Agriculture  
Minimum Lot Size: 2 acre(s)  
Special Area Regulation: -

8. Description of project:

The project is a major subdivision to create an 8 lot subdivision on a 23.2 acre lot, with 7 residential lots and 1 lot for Street A. Proposed lots would range in size between 2.00 and 7.81 net acres. The project site is located on Old Castle Road in the Valley Center Community Plan Area within unincorporated San Diego County. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Estate Development Area and Land Use Designation (17) Estate Residential. Zoning for the site is A70 (Limited Agriculture). The site is currently vacant. Access would be provided by a private road connecting to Old Castle Road. The project would be served by on-site septic systems and imported water from the Valley Center Water District. Extension of sewer or water utilities within the project site will occur as needed. Earthwork will consist of cut and fill of 7350 cubic yards of material.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Lands surrounding the project site to the north, east and west, are used for estate style single family dwelling units many of which still contain small active agricultural operations. The area to the south is largely undeveloped and is comprised of disturbed vegetation. The topography of the southern portion of the project site and adjacent land is comprised of rolling hills with slopes greater than 25 percent. The northern portion of the project site and a larger area to the north/north-west are flatter with no slopes exceeding 25 percent. The site is located approximately 4 miles east of I-15.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<b><u>Permit Type/Action</u></b>	<b><u>Agency</u></b>
Habitat Loss Permit	County of San Diego
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit Grading Permit Plan Change	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego

<b><u>Permit Type/Action</u></b>	<b><u>Agency</u></b>
Remandment of Relinquished Access Rights	County of San Diego
Septic Tank Permit	County of San Diego
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Valley Center Water District
Fire District Approval	Valley Center Fire Protection District

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or a “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- .. [Aesthetics](#)
- .. [Agriculture and Forest Resources](#)
- .. [Air Quality](#)
- p [Biological Resources](#)
- p [Cultural Resources](#)
- .. [Geology & Soils](#)
- .. [Greenhouse Gas Emissions](#)
- .. [Hazards & Haz. Materials](#)
- .. [Hydrology & Water Quality](#)
- .. [Land Use & Planning](#)
- .. [Mineral Resources](#)
- p [Noise](#)
- .. [Population & Housing](#)
- .. [Public Services](#)
- .. [Recreation](#)
- p [Transportation/Traffic](#)
- .. [Utilities & Service Systems](#)
- p [Mandatory Findings of Significance](#)

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)  
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- .. On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- p On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- .. On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

---

Signature

Katie Hughes

---

Printed Name

---

Date

Land Use/Environmental Planner

---

Title

## INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

**I. AESTHETICS** -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- |    |  |          |                              |
|----|--|----------|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | ..       | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <b>p</b> | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

**No Impact:** The project site is located on Old Castle Road in the Valley Center Community Planning Area. Based on a site visit by County staff Lori Spar on June 2, 2003, the proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and will not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view. Therefore, the proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because: those projects will result in additional single family dwellings, a use which is consistent with the existing landscape in the area. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- |    |  |          |                              |
|----|--|----------|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <b>p</b> | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | ..       | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic ([Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program](#)). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Based on a site visit completed by Lori Spar on June 2, 2003, the proposed project is located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway (Old Castle Road).

The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within the composite viewshed of the scenic highway, including the underlying landform and overlaying landcover, establish the visual environment. The visual environment of the subject scenic highway and resources is on Old Castle Road; and the visual composition consists of gentle slopes, native vegetation, rural residential development, and sparse agricultural operations.

The proposed project is a 7-lot residential subdivision. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's in terms of visual character and quality for the following reasons: the building pads proposed by the project are similar in density to the development in the area.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because: those projects will result in additional single family dwellings, a use which is consistent with the existing landscape in the area. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of

the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as gentle slopes covered with native vegetation and developed with rural residential uses and sparse agricultural operations.

The proposed project is a 7-lot residential subdivision. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reasons: the development proposed by the project is similar in density and scale to the existing development in the surrounding area.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone A as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, approximately 14 miles from the Palomar Mountain Observatory. However, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115), including the Zone A lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights.

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to



issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level.

**II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	<b>b</b>	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site has land designated as Farmland of Local Importance according to the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). However, based on a site visit and a review of historic aerial photography, there is no evidence of agricultural use on the project site. In order to qualify for the Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance designations, land must have been cropped at some time during the four years prior to the last FMMP mapping date. Given the lack of agricultural use on the site within at least the past 4 years, the Farmland of Local Importance designation of this area according to the State is incorrect. The Farmland designation is likely misapplied as a result of the large scale of the Statewide mapping effort which assigns Farmland designations based on aerial photography and limited ground verification. Therefore, due to the lack of historic agricultural use at the project site, the site does not meet the definition of an agricultural resource and no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	<b>b</b>	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is zoned A70; Limited Agriculture, which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because single family residences are a permitted use in A70 zones and will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

- c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<b>p</b>	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site including offsite improvements do not contain forest lands or timberland. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the project is consistent with existing zoning and a rezone of the property is not proposed. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland production zones.

- d) Result in the loss of forest land , conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<b>p</b>	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of offsite forest resources.

- e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | b  | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The surrounding area within a radius of 3 miles of the project site has active agricultural operations such as avocado and citrus groves and farmland of local importance. As a result, the proposed project was reviewed by agricultural resources specialist Greg Kryzs and was determined not to have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance or active agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use for the following reasons:

- Surrounding active agricultural operations consist of avocado and/or citrus orchards which commonly operate among residential uses and create minimal land use conflicts due to the nature of the operation. Many surrounding residential lots also support small scale agricultural production. The addition of 7 residences would not introduce a change in the existing environment that could land uses.
- Active agricultural operations are separated from proposed land uses on the project site by Old Castle Road and other developed parcels.
- Active agricultural operations in the surrounding area are already interspersed with single family residential uses and the proposed use would not significantly change the existing land uses in the area, resulting in a change that could convert agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use.

Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

**III. AIR QUALITY** -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- |    |                                |   |                              |
|----|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | b | Less than Significant Impact |
|----|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|

.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation .. No Impact  
Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes development that was anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project will result in emissions of ozone precursors that were considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below the screening levels, and subsequently will not violate ambient air quality standards.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

.. Potentially Significant Impact      b Less than Significant Impact  
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation .. No Impact  
Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes a 7-lot residential subdivision. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 84 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less

than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) under the CAAQS. O<sub>3</sub> is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM<sub>10</sub> in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and also as the result of increase of traffic from project implementation. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, localized and temporary resulting in PM<sub>10</sub> and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 84 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria

established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM<sub>10</sub>, or any O<sub>3</sub> precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12<sup>th</sup> Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project will introduce the following new “sensitive receptors” into the project area : 7 single family residences. However, based on consultation with DPLU staff air quality specialist and a site visit conducted by Lori Spar on June 2, 2003, the project is not located within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of any identified point source of significant emissions. Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots.. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because proposed project as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane, alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the construction and operational phases. However, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m<sup>3</sup>). Subsequently, no

significant air quality – odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors. Moreover, the effects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
b	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of aerial photographs and a Biological Resources Letter Report (Vince Scheidt, Jun 9, 2010), habitat onsite includes 23.2 acres of southern mixed chaparral. No sensitive plant species were observed onsite. One sensitive wildlife species was observed onsite: orange-throated whiptail (*Cnemidophorus hyperythrus*). All habitat on-site will be impacted due to grading of housing pads, road construction and fire-clearing. To mitigate for loss of habitat, the project will purchase 11.6 acres of offsite southern mixed chaparral habitat.

County staff has reviewed the past, present, and probable future projects as listed in Section XVII(b) and has determined that the cumulative loss of southern mixed chaparral may cause a significant impact on candidate, sensitive, or special status species. However, this project's contribution to the cumulative habitat loss will be less than cumulatively considerable due to offsite purchase of habitat. The purchase of off-site habitat within a larger preserved habitat area will reduce this project's contribution to cumulative biological impacts by contributing to the development of large, biologically viable areas that support candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

Therefore, staff has determined that although the site supports native biological habitat, implementation of the mitigation measures described above will ensure that removal of this habitat will not result in substantial adverse effects, or have a cumulatively considerable impact to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- 16 -

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| b  | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** The project site contains southern mixed chaparral which is recognized as a sensitive natural community by the County, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. As detailed in response a) above, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to sensitive natural communities identified in the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, MSCP, Fish and Game Code, and Endangered Species Act are considered less than significant through the implementation of off-site habitat purchase.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | b  | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on the Biological Resources Report dated June 9, 2010 and prepared by Vince Scheidt, staff has been determined that the proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | b  | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:



**Less than Significant Impact:** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos and a Biological Resources Report dated June 9, 2010 prepared by Vince Scheidt, staff biologist, Ashley Gungle, has determined that the site has limited biological value and impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites would not be expected as a result of the proposed project for the following reasons: the project site does not contain habitat suitable for wildlife nursery sites and is surrounded by existing residential development in all directions. With the offsite habitat purchase required for mitigation of project impacts, the project will contribute to the development of large, biologically viable areas that provide wildlife corridors and native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, the project's contribution to any cumulative impact will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated August 24, 2010 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP). The project would not conflict with provisions in these Ordinances due to mitigation requirements for biological resources.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Carolyn Kyle of Kyle Consulting on July 25, 2003, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in a cultural resources report titled, "*Cultural Resource Survey for Beauvis Tentative Map, Valley Center Community Planning Area County of San Diego, California*", prepared by Carolyn Kyle of Kyle Consulting, dated August 2003.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist Carolyn Kyle of Kyle Consulting on July 25, 2003, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. The results of the survey are provided in an cultural resource survey report titled, "*Cultural Resource Survey for Beauvis Tentative Map, Valley Center Community Planning Area County of San Diego, California*", prepared by Carolyn Kyle of Kyle Consulting, dated August 2003. Grading monitoring, consisting of a County-approved archaeologist and Native American observer, will be a required condition of project approval because of the proximity of known archaeological sites, lack of ground visibility during the survey, and because the area to be developed consists mostly of undisturbed native vegetation.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County.

**No Impact:** The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology

Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| .. Potentially Significant Impact                     | .. Less than Significant Impact            |
| .. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains.

e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| .. Potentially Significant Impact                     | .. Less than Significant Impact            |
| .. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Carolyn Kyle of Kyle Consulting on July 25, 2003, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, *Cultural Resource Survey for Beauvis Tentative Map, Valley Center Community Planning Area County of San Diego, California*, prepared by Carolyn Kyle of Kyle Consulting, dated August 2003. Grading monitoring, consisting of a County-approved archaeologist and Native American observer, will be a required condition of project approval because of the proximity of known archaeological sites, lack of ground visibility during the survey, and because the area to be developed consists mostly of undisturbed native vegetation.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?  
Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p  | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | p  | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | p  | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be there will be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is low, earthquake-induced lateral

spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. While the site's slopes contain slopes greater than 25% in grade, the house pads are located on slopes less than 25% in grade. According to the Geologic Map of the Pala 7.5' Quadrangle (2000), the site is reportedly underlain by Cretaceous age monzogranite with no landslide deposits mapped on or near the site. Based on the topography and geologic environment, the site has a low potential for landslides. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from landslides

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Cieneba very rocky coarse sandy loam and vista rocky coarse sandy loam that has a soil erodibility rating of severe as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Stormwater Management Plan dated February 8, 2010, prepared by Aquaterra Engineering, Inc. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site: bioretention facilities and vegetated swales.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves 7,350 cubic yards of grading that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill. In order to assure that any proposed buildings (including those proposed on the project site) are adequately supported (whether on native soils, cut or fill), a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California

Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. With this standard requirement, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are Cienega very rocky coarse sandy loam, 30 to 75 percent slopes, Vista rocky coarse sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes, Fallbrook sandy loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes, eroded, and Placentia sandy loam, thick surface, 2 to 9 percent slopes. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves 7 proposed on-site wastewater systems. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized,

spaced, constructed and maintained.” The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, “On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria.” DEH approved the project's OSWS on July 8, 2010. Therefore, the project has soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems as determined by the authorized, local public agency. In addition, the project will comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chap. 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** – Would the project:

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- |    |  |                                  |                              |
|----|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | ..                               | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons (HFCs), and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources. A regional GHG inventory prepared for the San Diego Region<sup>1</sup> identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for 46% of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (25%) and third (9%) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and

---

<sup>1</sup> San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory: An Analysis of Regional Emissions and Strategies to Achieve AB 32 Targets. University of San Diego and the Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC), September 2008.



particulate matter, ecosystem changes, and increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State of California passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

According to the San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory (2008), the region must reduce its GHG emissions by 33 percent from “business-as-usual” emissions to achieve 1990 emissions levels by the year 2020. “Business-as-usual” refers to the 2020 emissions that would have occurred in the absence of the mandated reductions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. Development of regional targets is underway and SANDAG is in the process of preparing the region’s Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which will be a new element of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The strategy will identify how regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by the ARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

In addressing the potential for a project to generate GHG emissions that would have a potentially significant cumulative effect on the environment, a 900 metric ton threshold was selected to identify those projects that would be required to calculate emissions and implement mitigation measures to reduce a potentially significant impact. The 900 metric ton screening threshold is based on a threshold included in the CAPCOA white paper<sup>2</sup> that covers methods for addressing greenhouse gas emissions under CEQA. The CAPCOA white paper references the 900 metric ton guideline as a conservative threshold for requiring further analysis and mitigation. The 900 metric ton threshold was based on a review of data from four diverse cities (Los Angeles in southern California and Pleasanton, Dublin, and Livermore in northern California) to identify the threshold that would capture at least 90% of the residential units or office space on the pending applications list. This threshold will require a substantial portion of future development to minimize GHG emissions to ensure implementation of AB 32 targets is not impeded. By ensuring that projects that generate more than 900 metric tons of GHG implement mitigation measures to reduce emissions, it is expected that a majority of future

---

<sup>2</sup> See CAPCOA White Paper : “CEQA & Climate Change: *Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act*” January 2008 (<http://www.capcoa.org/rokdownloads/CEQA/CAPCOA%20White%20Paper.pdf>).

development will contribute to emission reduction goals that will assist the region in meeting its GHG reduction targets.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) states that an EIR shall analyze greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a proposed project when the incremental contribution of those emissions may be cumulatively considerable.

The project is a 7-lot residential subdivision and is expected to generate less than 900 metric tons of GHG emissions based on estimates of GHG emissions for various project types included in the CAPCOA white paper<sup>3</sup>. Emissions from the project will be generated from vehicle trips, water consumption, waste generation and disposal, and residential fuel combustion. The project's GHG emissions are found to have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to GHG emissions because the project will generate less than 900 metric tons of GHGs.

Furthermore, projects that generate less than 900 metric tons of GHG, will also participate in emission reductions because air emissions including GHGs are under the purview of CARB (or other regulatory agencies) and will be "regulated" either by CARB, the Federal Government, or other entities. For example, new vehicles will be subject to increased fuel economy standards and emission reductions<sup>4</sup>, large and small appliances will be subject to more strict emissions standards, and energy delivered to consumers will increasingly come from renewable sources<sup>5</sup>. As a result, even the emissions that result from projects that produce less than 900 metric tons of GHG will be subject to emission reductions. Likewise, the project would also participate in the mandated emissions reductions through energy and resource use that is subject to emission reduction mandates beyond "business-as-usual."

Therefore, it is determined that the project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

---

<sup>3</sup> 900 metric tons of GHG emissions are estimated to be generated by 50 Single Family Residential units, 70 apartments/condos, 35,000 sf of general commercial/office, 11,000 sf of retail, or 6,300 sf of supermarket/grocery space.

<sup>4</sup> On September 15, 2009, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of Transportation's National Highway Safety Administration (NHTSA) proposed a national program to reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel economy for new cars and trucks sold in the United States. The proposed standards would cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by an estimated 950 million metric tons and 1.8 billion barrels of oil over the lifetime of the vehicles sold under the program.

<sup>5</sup> California's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) requires electric corporations to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources by at least 1% of their retail sales annually, until they reach 20% by 2010. In 2008, the governor signed Executive Order S-14-08 (EO) to streamline California's renewable energy project approval process and increase the state's Renewable Energy Standard to 33% renewable power by 2020. The Air Resources Board is in the process of developing regulations to implement the 33% standard known as the California Renewable Electricity Standard (RES).

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. Development of regional targets is underway and SANDAG is in the process of preparing the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which will be a new element of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The strategy will identify how regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by the ARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

To implement State mandates to address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The County of San Diego is currently in the process of updating its General Plan and incorporating associated climate change policies. These policies will provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets.

Until local plans are developed to address greenhouse gas emissions, such as a local Sustainable Communities Strategy and updated General Plan Policies, the project is evaluated to determine whether it would impede the implementation of AB 32 GHG reduction targets. For the reasons discussed in the response to question VII.a), the project would not impede the implementation of AB 32 reduction targets. Therefore, the

project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

**VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and therefore would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

- b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on a site visit and regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank, and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
----	--------------------------------	----	------------------------------

- .. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      p      No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- .. Potentially Significant Impact      p      Less than Significant Impact  
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ..      No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

- i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

- ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a

project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

**Less Than Significant Impact:**

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

**No Impact:** The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

**Less Than Significant Impact:**

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

**No Impact:** The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:**

The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 16 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, Tentative Parcel Map, or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated June 8, 2010, have been received from the Valley Center Fire Protection District. The conditions from the Valley Center Fire Protection District include: annexation into the Valley Center Fire Protection District CFD 2008-01 prior to the approval of the Final Map. The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the

expected emergency travel time to the project site to be 3-5 minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the County Public Facilities Element is 10 minutes. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and through compliance with the Valley Center Fire Protection District's conditions, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code.

- h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by Lori Spar on June 2, 2003 there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

**IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** -- Would the project:

- a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes a 7-lot residential subdivision which requires an NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a copy of a Stormwater Management Plan dated February 8, 2010 which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the NPDES permit. The project site proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control



BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: silt fence, street sweeping and vacuuming, stockpile management, solid waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, gravel bag berm, material delivery and storage, concrete waste management, paving and grinding operations, preservation of well draining soils, setback development envelope from drainages, retil soils compacted by construction vehicles/equipment, rural swales, and bioretention swales. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project will conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

- b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project lies in the San Luis Rey hydrologic subarea, within the 903.13 hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, June 2007, although the mouth of the San Luis Rey impaired for coliform bacteria, no portion of the San Luis Rey River, which is tributary to the Pacific Ocean, is impaired. Constituents of concern in the San Luis Rey River watershed include coliform bacteria, nitrate, sediment, and pesticides.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: grading for the proposed on-site private easement road and pads for 7 single family dwellings. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: silt fence, street sweeping and vacuuming, stockpile management, solid waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, gravel bag berm, material delivery and storage, concrete waste management, paving

and grinding operations, preservation of well draining soils, setback development envelope from drainages, retil soils compacted by construction vehicles/equipment, rural swales, and bioretention swales.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the San Luis Rey hydrologic subarea, within the 903.13 hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply; industrial service supply; freshwater replenishment; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities associated with the proposed on-site private easement road and single family dwellings. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: silt fence, street sweeping and vacuuming, stockpile management, solid waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, gravel bag berm, material delivery and storage, concrete waste management, paving and grinding operations, preservation of well draining soils, setback development envelope from drainages, retil soils compacted by construction vehicles/equipment, rural swales, and bioretention swales.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will obtain its water supply from the Valley Center Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or

commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes 7-lot residential subdivision. As outlined in the Storm water Management Plan (SWMP) dated February 8, 2010 and prepared by Aquaterra Engineering, Inc., the project will implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: bioretention facilities and vegetated swales. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMP's that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | p  | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons, based on a Drainage Study prepared by Aquaterra Engineering, Inc., dated August 21, 2008: drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will not substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | p  | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Based on a Drainage Study prepared by Aquaterra Engineering, Inc., dated August 21, 2008, the project stormwater runoff will be adequately transported offsite.

- h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | p  | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities associated with single family dwellings. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced

in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: silt fence, street sweeping and vacuuming, stockpile management, solid waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, gravel bag berm, material delivery and storage, concrete waste management, paving and grinding operations, preservation of well draining soils, setback development envelope from drainages, retil soils compacted by construction vehicles/equipment, rural swales, and bioretention swales. Refer to IX Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations; therefore, no impact will occur.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations; therefore, no impact will occur.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

- i. SEICHE

**No Impact:** The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

- ii. TSUNAMI

**No Impact:** The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

- iii. MUDFLOW

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Though the project does propose land disturbance that will expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils. Unless upstream areas were to become completely denuded in an event such as a fire, mudflow would not present a substantial risk to the planned building pad areas at the site. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING** -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- |    |  |          |                              |
|----|--|----------|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | ..       | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <b>p</b> | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- |    |  |          |                              |
|----|--|----------|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <b>p</b> | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | ..       | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 1.3 Estate Development Area (EDA) and General Plan Land Use Designation 17; Estate Residential. The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 2 acres where the average slope of a proposed parcel does not exceed 25% and 4 acres where the average slope of a proposed parcel is greater than 25% and not more than 0.5 dwelling units per acre, or 0.25 dwelling units per acre (determined by the average slope of the property). The proposed project has gross parcel sizes and density that are consistent with the General Plan. The project is subject to the policies of the Valley Center Community Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Valley Center Community Plan. The current zone is A70; Limited Agriculture, which requires a net minimum lot size of 2 acres. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

**XI. MINERAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- |    |  |          |                              |
|----|--|----------|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <b>p</b> | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | ..       | No Impact                    |



Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The lands within the project site have not been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997). However, the project site is surrounded by densely developed land uses including single family residences and agricultural operations which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is zoned A70; Limited Agriculture, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000).

Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

**XII. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** The project is consists of a seven single family residential lots immediately adjacent to Old Castle Road. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates dated June 3, 2010, noise mitigation is required for temporary construction operations. Installation of temporary construction noise barriers during the grading activities on Lots 1, 2 and 6 would ensure that the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Staff has also conducted an in-house review modeling the anticipated future traffic noise levels from Old Castle Road. The project subdivision is subject to the County Noise Element which requires proposed exterior noise sensitive land uses (NSLU) to a noise level of 60 decibels-A (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). The County General Plan EIR 2030 Referral LOS and Volume Plot Plan map shows a future average daily trip (ADT) of 6,500 on the segment of Old Castle Road. Based on a review by the County Noise Specialist Emmet Aquino on July 13, 2010, preliminary noise prediction estimates indicate that the future traffic 60 dBA CNEL would be located approximately 110 feet from the Old Castle road centerline. Based on the project preliminary grading plans, all proposed NSLU and buildable areas fall outside this noise contour threshold. The project subdivision, as currently designed would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates and dated June 3, 2010 and review by County Noise Specialist Emmet Aquino on July 13, 2010, non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned A70 that has a one-hour average daytime sound limit of 50 dBA. The the project's noise levels at the adjoining properties will not exceed County Noise Standards.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates dated June 3, 2010, the project would generate construction noise that would exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Primary noise sources exceeding the noise level limits of 75 dBA at the occupied property lines consists of grading operations. Proposed Lots 1 and 2 would generate a worst-case construction noise level as high as 79.6 dBA at the eastern property line. Proposed Lot 6 would generate a construction noise level of 76.9 dBA at the western property line. Temporary noise mitigation barriers would be eight-feet in height located along the property lines of Lots 1, 2, and 6. Lot 1 would require the temporary noise barrier along the eastern property line of Lot 1 extending 190 feet shielding grading activities for the proposed pad. Lot 2 would require the temporary noise barrier on the eastern property line of Lot 2 extending 170 feet. A similar temporary construction noise barrier would be located along the western property line of Lot 6. Installation of these temporary noise mitigation measures would reduce noise levels at Lots 1, 2, and 3 to 66.3, 66.2, and 64.5 dBA respectively. Therefore, incorporation of temporary construction noise mitigation measures would reduce noise levels to less than significant and comply with the County Noise Ordinance, 36.409. Construction operations would also occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404 and 36.409) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the facilities are typically setback more than 50 feet from any County Circulation Element (CE) roadway using rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise or vibration contours of 38 VdB or less; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline for heavy-duty truck activities would insure that these proposed uses or operations do

not have any chance of being impacted significantly by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* 1995, Rudy Hendriks, *Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations* 2002). This setback insures that this project site will not be affected by any future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise related to the adjacent roadways.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Vehicular traffic on nearby roadways and activities associated with a residential subdivision. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on review of the project by County staff on July 7, 2010. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates dated June 3, 2010, the project would generate construction noise that would exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Primary noise sources exceeding the noise level limits of 75 dBA at the occupied property lines consists of grading operations. Proposed Lots 1 and 2 would generate a worst-case construction noise level as high as 79.6 dBA at the eastern property line. Proposed Lot 6 would generate a construction noise level of 76.9 dBA at the western property line. Temporary noise mitigation barriers would be eight-feet in height located along the property lines of Lots 1, 2, and 6. Lot 1 would require the temporary noise barrier along the eastern property line of Lot 1 extending 190 feet shielding grading activities for the proposed pad. Lot 2 would require the temporary noise barrier on the eastern property line of Lot 2 extending 170 feet. A similar temporary construction noise barrier would be located along the western property line of Lot 6. Installation of these temporary noise mitigation measures would reduce noise levels at Lots 1, 2, and 3 to 66.3, 66.2, and 64.5 dBA respectively. Therefore, incorporation of temporary construction noise mitigation barriers would ensure County Noise Ordinance compliance and would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
----	--------------------------------	----	------------------------------

- |    |  |   |           |
|----|--|---|-----------|
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |
|----|--|---|-----------|

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

**XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING** -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p  | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p  | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not displace any existing housing since the site is currently vacant.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- |    |                                |    |                              |
|----|--------------------------------|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
|----|--------------------------------|----|------------------------------|

.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation  
Incorporated      p No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

.. Potentially Significant Impact      .. Less than Significant Impact  
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation      p No Impact  
Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Valley Center Water District, Valley Center Fire Protection District, Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

**XV. RECREATION**

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | b  | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project involves a 7-lot residential subdivision that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The proposed project opted to pay park fees. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication and thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

With regard to regional recreational facilities, there are over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State Parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive acreage of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation, the project will not result in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland. Moreover, the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant amount of regional recreational facilities will be available to County residents.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | b  | No Impact                    |



Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC** -- Would the project:

- a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
b	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation: The County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Guidelines) establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. These Guidelines incorporate standards from the County of San Diego Public Road Standards and Public Facilities Element (PFE), the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program and the Congestion Management Program.

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** A Traffic Impact Study, dated November 25, 2008, prepared by Darnell & Associates on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use under Environmental Review Number 03-02-035 was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study concluded that the proposed project will result in an additional 84 ADT. The addition of 84 ADT will not result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity pursuant to the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance.

**DIRECT IMPACT:**

*The proposed project will result in an additional 84 ADT. The project was reviewed by the Department of Public Works and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: The proposed project would not result in a degradation of the level of service (LOS) of affected roadways. Old Castle Road is a Collector Road with Bike Lanes on the San Diego County Circulation Element of the General Plan with a current LOS D (8,956 ADT) {threshold of 10,900 ADT for LOS D, based upon existing 2-lane road}. The traffic volume from the project (84 ADT) would not result in any impacts, degradation, or threshold increase on Old Castle Road. Therefore, the project will not have a significant*

*direct project level impact increase in traffic, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.*

CUMULATIVE IMPACT:

A Traffic Impact Study, dated November 25, 2008, prepared by Darnell & Associates on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use under Environmental Review Number 03-02-035 was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study concluded that the proposed project will result in an additional 84 ADT. The addition of 84 ADT will result in a cumulative potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity pursuant to for the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance. The proposed project will have a cumulative impact along the following roadway segments: Gopher Canyon Road, from Holly Hill Road to I-15; Champagne Boulevard, from Gopher Canyon Road to Old Castle Road; Lilac Road, from Old Castle Road to Valley Center Road; and Valley Center Road, from Miller Road to Woods Valley Road.

The proposed project will have a cumulative impact along the following roadway intersections: Gopher Canyon Road/ I-15 (southbound ramps); Gopher Canyon Road/ I-15 (northbound ramps); Old Castle Road/ Lilac Road, and Lilac Road/ Valley Center Road.

The potential cumulative impacts are mitigated to less than significant with the following mitigation:

*The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This Program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, State, and Federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.*

*The proposed project generates 84 ADT. These trips will be distributed on circulation element roadways in the County that were analyzed by the TIF Program, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth*

*projections upon which the TIF Program is based. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.*

- b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation: The designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) of which the Congestion Management Program (CMP) is an element to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The CMP includes a requirement for enhanced CEQA review applicable to certain large developments that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the project's impacts on CMP system roadways, their associated costs, and identify appropriate mitigation. Early project coordination with affected public agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) is required to ensure that the impacts of new development on CMP transit performance measures are identified.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes an increase of 84 ADTs. The additional 84 ADTs from the proposed project do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program. Additionally, the project does not involve construction of any new buildings, nor does it propose a new primary use. The additional access or support structures will not generate ADTs on a daily basis. Therefore the project will not conflict with travel demand measures or other standards of the congestion management agency.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project will not significantly alter traffic safety on Old Castle Road. Safe and adequate sight distance shall be required at all driveways and intersections to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. All road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project is not served by a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum cumulative length permitted by the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code, therefore, the project has adequate emergency access. Additionally, roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** The proposed project is a 7-lot residential subdivision and will generate 84 ADT. Project implementation will not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project will not conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

**XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | p  | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves 7 proposed on-site wastewater systems. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on July 8, 2010. Therefore, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized, local public agency.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p  | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Based on the service availability forms received, the project will not require construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate adequate water and/or wastewater treatment facilities are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Valley Center Water District. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project involves new and/or expanded storm water drainage facilities. The new and/or expanded facilities include a proposed drainage pipe, riprap energy dissipater, concrete lined drainage ditch, type A curb outlet, and type G catch basin. Refer to the Storm water Management Plan dated February 8, 2010 for more information. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form, the new and/or expanded facilities will not result in adverse physical effect on the environment. Specifically, refer to Section IX for more information.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project requires water service from the Valley Center Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Valley Center Water District has been provided, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will rely completely on an on-site wastewater system (septic system); therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

**Discussion/Explanation:**

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly biological and cultural resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes off-site mitigation habitat purchase and archaeological grading monitoring. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?



- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| p  | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Anderson Minor Subdivision	TPM 20637
Wilkes Road Major Use Permit	P 73-188
Castlecrest Minor Subdivision	TPM 19747
Fitzpatrick Minor Subdivision	TPM 20842
Glick/AT&T Minor Use Permit	ZAP 03-071
Glick/AT&T Major Use Permit	P 03-075
Sprint/Nextel West Lilac	P 06-066
Vista Terraza Minor Subdivision	TPM 20056
Saric Minor Subdivision	TPM 20265
Walther Minor Subdivision	TPM 20204
Sharp Minor Subdivision	TPM 20595
Moddelmoa Minor Subdivision	TPM 20266
Crampton Minor Subdivision	TPM 19700

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVIII of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to transportation and traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the transportation impact fee. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- |    |  |    |                              |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact                     | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| p  | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, IX Hydrology and Water Quality XII. Noise, XIII. Population and Housing, and XVI. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to the following: noise and transportation/traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes temporary noise attenuation barrier(s) and payment of the transportation impact fee. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

## **XIX. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to [www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov). For County regulation refer to [www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com). All other references are available upon request.

Biology Report, Vince Sheidt, June 9, 2010

Cultural Resource Survey, Kyle Consulting, August 2003

Fire Protection Plan, Firewise 2000, Inc., June 6, 2010

Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Report, Aquaterra Engineering, Inc., August 21, 2008

Stormwater Management Plan, Aquaterra Engineering, Inc., February 8, 2010

Acoustical Analysis Report, Eilar Associates, Inc., June 3, 2010

Traffic Study, Darnell & Associates, Inc., November 25, 2008

### **AESTHETICS**

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.  
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.  
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326.  
([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances.  
([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).  
(<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000  
(<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.  
([www.intl-light.com](http://www.intl-light.com))

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003.  
([www.lrc.rpi.edu](http://www.lrc.rpi.edu))

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA.  
(<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.  
([www.blm.gov](http://www.blm.gov))

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.  
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

#### AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.  
([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.  
([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.  
([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.  
([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov), [www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.  
([www.qp.gov.bc.ca](http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca))

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.  
([www.nrcs.usda.gov](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov), [www.swcs.org](http://www.swcs.org)).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. ([soils.usda.gov](http://soils.usda.gov))

#### AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. ([www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov))

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. ([www.co-san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co-san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. ([www.dfg.ca.gov](http://www.dfg.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2.  
([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). ([www.co-san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co-san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5<sup>th</sup> Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987.  
(<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. ([www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996.  
([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. ([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. ([ecos.fws.gov](http://ecos.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002.  
([migratorybirds.fws.gov](http://migratorybirds.fws.gov))

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

# 3100-5315; BEAUVAIS INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

October 7, 2010

- 60 -

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

## GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. ([soils.usda.gov](http://soils.usda.gov))

## HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. ([www.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov>), ([www.oes.ca.gov](http://www.oes.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization  
Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June  
1995.

Uniform Building Code. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western  
Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference  
of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection  
Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R,  
1996 Edition. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

#### HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service  
Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A  
Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water  
Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources  
State of California. 1998. ([rubicon.water.ca.gov](http://rubicon.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, California's  
Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003.  
([www.groundwater.water.ca.gov](http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No.  
8, August 2000. ([www.dpla2.water.ca.gov](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov))

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, §  
8680-8692. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES  
General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL  
ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction  
Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm  
Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000  
et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board,  
Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan.  
([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division  
7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and  
Watercourses. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994.  
([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov), <http://www.amlegal.com>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan,  
2002. ([www.projectcleanwater.org](http://www.projectcleanwater.org))

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water  
Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance,  
Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7,  
Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory  
Ordinances and amendments. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68.  
Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined  
Floodways. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972,  
Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-  
Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United  
States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220,  
1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.  
([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water  
Code Division 7. Water Quality. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality  
Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997.  
([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES  
Permit No. CAS0108758. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water  
Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin.  
([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

#### LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and  
Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land  
Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San  
Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996.  
([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines,  
2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources  
Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations,  
Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title  
14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001.  
([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51,  
California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and  
Procedures, January 2000. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title  
8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84:  
Project Facility. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989.  
([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land  
Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County.  
([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and  
amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000.  
([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance,  
compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631.  
1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego  
County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by  
Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and  
Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press  
Books, 1999. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

#### MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq.  
1969. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))



# 3100-5315; BEAUVAIS INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

October 7, 2010

- 62 -

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

## NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. ([www.iso.ch](http://www.iso.ch))

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

## POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

## RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

## TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. ([www.dot.ca.gov](http://www.dot.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities

Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. ([www.gpoaccess.gov](http://www.gpoaccess.gov))

## UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. ([ccr.oal.ca.gov](http://ccr.oal.ca.gov))

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. ([www.sdcounty.ca.gov](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov))

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.